

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

January 2016

PREPARING OFFICE

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Worland Field Office



Worksheet Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior— Bureau of Land Management

Introduction

OFFICE: Worland Field Office

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-WY-R010-2015-0048-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: RIPS #018923

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Saltcedar and Russian olive Treatment – Sand Draw/Invasive Species

APPLICANT (if any): Worland Field Office/Hot Springs County Weed and Pest

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Hot Springs County/T44R95 Sections 1-4

T45R95 Sections 31-33

T44R96 Section 1-2, 6

T45R96 Sections 25-32

T44R97 Sections 1,2,12

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

Hot Springs County Weed and Pest is proposing a Tamarisk and Russian Olive treatment in Sand Draw starting some time in December and ending in April. The treatment would involve mastication of Tamarisk and cut stump of the Russian Olive. Equipment to be used would be two track hoes, two pickup trucks and a skid steer. An applicator will follow immediately behind the removal with triclopyr and bark oil to treat any roots or stumps. All slash piles would be left untouched for a year and then combined into several larger piles to be burned.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

The proposed action and alternatives described below are in conformance with the Worland Resource Management Plan, signed September 21, 2015. The management objective is to *“Manage for healthy native plant communities by reducing, preventing expansion of, or eliminating the occurrence of undesirable invasive, nonnative species, undesirable, nonnative, or noxious weeds by implementing management actions consistent with national guidance and state and local weed management plans”* (p.76).

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

DOI-BLM-WY-R010-2010-0026-EA, Invasive Plant Management – Worland/Cody Field Office, signed 01/24/2011.

Vegetation Treatments in 17 Western States, Programmatic Report, BLM, 2007. This document addresses the general effects on the environment of using non-herbicide treatment methods, including mechanical, manual, prescription fire, and biological control methods.

The National Environmental Policy Act, 1969. This act requires preparation of EISs for federal projects that may have a significant effect on the environment and systematic, interdisciplinary planning to ensure the integrated use of natural and social sciences and environmental design arts in making decisions about major federal actions that may have a significant effect on the environment.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The new proposed action is a feature of the proposed action alternative analyzed in DOI-BLM-WY-R010-2010-0026-EA, Invasive Plant Management – Worland/Cody Field Office, signed 01/24/2011. The project is in the same analysis area.

The proposed action stated that noxious and invasive plant control would be accomplished by using an integrated pest management approach, utilizing a combination of biological, mechanical, chemical methods.

The proposed action also incorporated by reference *The Vegetation Treatments Using Herbicides in 17 Western States, Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (BLM, 2007)*, which analyzed the effects of using herbicides for treating vegetation on public land in the western United States. The *Record of Decision's* preferred alternative approved the use of the following 18 herbicide active ingredients: 2, 4-D, bromacil, chlorsulfuron, clopyralid, dicamba, diuron, glyphosate, hexazinone, imazapyr, metsulfuron methyl, picloram, sulfometuron methyl, tebuthiuron, triclopyr, imazapic, diquat, diflufenzopyr (in formulation with dicamba), and fluridone.

The use of herbicides would be applied either aerially or by ground throughout the field office, with no one treatment area more than 300 acres.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The range of alternatives analyzed in DOI-BLM-WY-R0101-2010-0026-EA, Invasive Plant Management – Worland/Cody Field Office, signed 01/24/2011 is appropriate with respect to the current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values. This EA analyzed three alternatives, Alternative A (PROPOSED ACTION), Alternative B (CONTINUE PRESENT MANAGEMENT (NO ACTION)) and Alternative C (NO HERBICIDE USE)

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species

listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The existing analysis is valid because there is no new information or circumstances that weren't considered in DOI-BLM-WY-R0101-2010-0026-EA in relation to the proposed action of Tamarisk and Russian olive treatment in Sand Draw.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The direct, indirect, and cumulative effects for the new proposed action are the same both quantitatively and qualitatively to those analyzed in DOI-BLM-WY-R0101-2010-0026-EA, Invasive Plant Management – Worland/Cody Field Office, signed 01/24/2011.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The public involvement and interagency review associated with DOI-BLM-WY-R010-2010-0026-EA, Invasive Plant Management – Worland/Cody Field Office, signed 01/24/2011 are adequate for the new proposed action because no comments were received from either entity during or following scoping.

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

TRIBES, INDIVIDUALS, ORGANIZATIONS, or AGENCIES CONSULTED

Agency/Tribe/Organization
Hot Springs County Weed and Pest
SHPO

BLM Staff Consulted

Resource	Name	Title
Cultural Resources	Dora Ridenour	Archaeologist
Fish/Wildlife (including T&E)	Tim Stephens	Wildlife Biologist
Recreation/VRM/Travel Management/Special Designations	Adam Babcock	Recreation/Visual Specialist
Rangeland/Vegetation	Karen Hepp	Range Management Specialist
T&E Plants	Karen Hepp	Range Management Specialist (T&E/Sensitive Plants)
Engineering	Jim Critz	Civil Engineer
Fluid Minerals	Franklin Sanders	Natural Resource Specialist
Water resources	Jared Dalebout	Hydrologist
Paleontology	Dora Ridenour	Archaeologist
Geology & Minerals	Frank Sanders	Petroleum Engineer
Land Use/Access	Connie Craft	Realty Specialist
Fire Ecology	Eve Warren	Natural Resource Specialist

Forests	Jim Gates	Forester
Public Health and Safety	Darci Stafford	Petroleum Engineer Planning & Environmental Coordinator
Socioeconomics	Holly Elliott	Planning & Environmental Coordinator
Air Quality	Holly Elliott	Planning & Environmental Coordinator
Minerals and Lands	Amelia Pennington	Assistant Field Manager
Resources	John Elliott	Assistant Field Manager

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

Conclusion (If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.)

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

<i>/s/ Leslie Colman</i>	1/8/2016
Signature of Project Lead	Date
<i>/s/ Holly Elliott</i>	1/8/2016
Signature of NEPA Coordinator	Date
<i>/s/ Michael J. Phillips</i>	1/8/2016
Signature of the Responsible Official	Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.